arXiv:1605.01811v1 [math.CA] 6 May 2016

DARBOUX CALCULUS

MARCO ALDI AND ALEXANDER MCCLEARY

Abstract. We introduce a formalism to analyze partially defined functions between ordered sets. We show that our construction provides a uniform and conceptual approach to all the main definitions encountered in elementary real analysis including Dedekind cuts, limits and continuity.

1. introduction

Following the pioneering work of Bolzano and Weierstrass, "(ε, δ)-definitions" are at the heart of textbook presentations of elementary analysis (e.g. [4]). While with practice the motivated student quickly becomes proficient in this language, it is natural to ask if fundamental notions such as limits, continuity and integrals could perhaps be defined more conceptually.

In the present paper we develop a rather general framework, which we refer to as *Darboux calculus* that when specialized to the context of real analysis provides a unified and conceptual approach to all the main definitions encountered in, say, single variable calculus. Our starting point is the observation that the completeness of the ordered set of extended real numbers $\widehat{\mathbb{R}} = \{\pm\infty\} \cup \mathbb{R}$ is equivalent to the validity of the following

Lemma 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a (partially) ordered set, let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ be any subset and let $\psi : \mathcal{S} \to \widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ be an order preserving function. Then the set of order preserving functions $f : \mathcal{O} \to \widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ whose restriction to $\mathcal{S}$ coincides with ψ has a maximum and a minimum.*

In particular, such an order preserving function ψ singles out a distinguished subset $\mathrm{Dar}(\psi) \subseteq \mathcal{O}$, the *Darboux set of* ψ, of elements on which the maximum and minimum extensions of ψ coincide. Equivalently, $\mathrm{Dar}(\psi)$ can be thought of as the subset to which ψ extends canonically. We denote this canonical extension by ex_ψ. The prototypical example of this construction is provided by the Darboux integral. As shown in Example 7.8 if $\mathcal{O}$ is the set of all bounded functions on an interval $[a, b] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{S}$ is the subset of step functions and ψ is the function that to each step function assigns its integral defined naively in terms of signed areas of rectangles then $\mathrm{Dar}(\psi)$ coincides with the set of Darboux integrable functions on $[a, b]$ and ex_ψ is the Darboux integral.

This approach to the Darboux integral exemplifies the philosophy of this paper: naturally occurring pairs $(\mathcal{X}, \varphi)$ consisting of a class of $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$-valued functions and an order preserving function $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \to \widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ are of the form $(\mathrm{Dar}(\psi), \mathrm{ex}_\psi)$ for a suitable order preserving function ψ defined on a subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ of functions that "obviously belong to $\mathcal{X}$".

For instance, as shown in Example 7.5, if $\mathcal{O}$ is the set of all sequences of real numbers, $\mathcal{S}$ is the subset of sequences that are eventually constant and ψ is the function that to each sequence $\eta \in \mathcal{S}$ assigns the only value that η attains infinitely many times then $\mathrm{Dar}(\psi)$ coincides with the set of convergent (possibly to $\pm\infty$) sequences and $\mathrm{ex}_\psi(f) = \lim_n f(n)$ for every $f \in \mathrm{Dar}(\psi)$. The advantage here is that instead of having to come up with a clever (ε, δ)-definition of limit of a sequence we only need to prescribe the obvious limit of an eventually constant sequence and the formalism of Darboux calculus automatically takes care of the general case.

Similarly, let $\mathcal{O}$ be the set of all functions $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. It is shown in Example 7.6 that if $\mathcal{S}$ denotes the set of all functions that are constant on some open neighborhood of x_0 and ψ is the function that to each $\eta \in \mathcal{S}$ assigns $\psi(\eta) = \eta(x_0)$, then $\mathrm{Dar}(\psi)$ is the set of functions that are continuous at x_0 and $\mathrm{ex}_\psi(f) = f(x_0)$ for all $f \in \mathrm{Dar}(\psi)$. It is sufficient to know the functions that are obviously continuous at x_0 for our machinery to return the set of functions that are continuous at x_0 as output, which provides an intuitive alternative to the standard (ε, δ)-definition of continuity.

The statement of Lemma 1.1 holds more generally if $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ is replaced with any ordered set that is complete in the sense that every subset has a least upper bound and a greatest lower bound. Furthermore, the inclusion $\iota : \mathcal{S} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}$ can be replaced with an arbitrary embedding of ordered sets. In fact, the reader familiar with category theory will easily recognize the maximum and minimum extensions of ψ in Lemma 1.1 as, respectively, the left and right Kan extensions [3] of ψ along ι. Similarly, the Darboux set of ψ can be thought of as the equalizer of the left and right Kan extensions. Here we are implicitly using the standard interpretation of an ordered set $\mathcal{O}$ a category with objects are the elements $x \in \mathcal{O}$ and such that $\mathrm{Hom}(x, y)$ consists of a single element if $x \leq y$ and is empty otherwise. From the vantage point of category theory, the present paper can be summarized as the observation that equalizers of left and right Kan extensions arise naturally in elementary analysis. While some of our propositions and theorems are particular instances of much more general results about left and right Kan extensions, we choose to give self-contained proofs in the case of ordered sets. In this way, we hope to provide evidence of the effectiveness of Darboux calculus as a stand-alone approach to the foundations of analysis that might be one day used to teach the subject at the undergraduate level.

An example of the flexibility of categorical thinking in this context comes from looking at the Yoneda embedding of an ordered set $\mathcal{O}$ into the set of non-increasing functions from $\mathcal{O}$ to the unique (up to a unique isomorphism) nontrivial ordered set with two elements. As it turns out, the Darboux set of the identity function of the image of the Yoneda embedding essentially coincides with the Dedekind-MacNeille completion of $\mathcal{O}$. While the idea of understanding Dedekind cuts in terms of presheaves is not new (see e.g. [5]), our emphasis is on the fact that not only Darboux sets are effective in isolating interesting classes of $\mathbb{R}$-valued functions but can be used to construct $\mathbb{R}$-itself! In fact we show that with a little more effort the field structure of $\mathbb{R}$ can also be recovered from that of $\mathbb{Q}$ in terms of Kan extensions. Our exposition appears to be somewhat more succinct, direct and self-contained

than previous treatments of elementary analysis based on category theory e.g. [7], [6], [1]. It would be interesting to carry out a detailed comparison between these approaches and the one presented here.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains basic material on ordered sets and order preserving functions. In Section 3 we introduce the main concepts used in this paper, including Darboux sets and Darboux extensions. Section 4 is devoted to the notion of completeness defined here in terms of extensions of partially defined order preserving functions. In Sections 5-6 we discuss the Yoneda embedding and the completion of arbitrary ordered sets. In particular in Section 5 we use Darboux extensions to prove that completely integrally closed subgroups of automorphisms of a complete ordered set lift to automorphisms of the completion, a result that we use to construct the field operations on $\mathbb{R}$. Our strategy here can be thought of as a Darboux-theoretic version of the approach used in [2] to establish similar results directly at the level of Dedekind cuts. Once the real numbers are constructed, we shift our attention to ordered sets of $\mathbb{R}$-valued functions in Section 7. We prove that an $\mathbb{R}$-valued function f has limit with respect to some filter basis F on the domain (in the sense that each ε-neighborhood of the limit contains the image $f(\mathcal{S})$ of some $\mathcal{S} \in F$) if and only if f is in the Darboux set of the function that maps a function η that is constant on some $\mathcal{S} \in F$ to $\eta(\mathcal{S})$. This result yields at once Darboux-theoretic formulations of the usual (ϵ, δ)-definitions of limits of sequences, limits of functions of one real variable and continuity. After discussing Darboux integrability (after which the general notion of Darboux set is modeled) we use Darboux calculus to prove a Linearity Theorem which simultaneously generalizes the usual linearity theorems for limits, continuous functions and integrals. While the present paper is chiefly focused on expressing (ε, δ)-definitions in the language of Darboux calculus, we include the Linearity Theorem as evidence that the machinery developed here can also be employed to obtain direct and often elegant proofs of some of the cornerstone theorems of calculus. We hope to come back to this point elsewhere and ultimately provide an exhaustive and fully self-contained treatment of elementary real analysis in the language of this paper.

2. Preliminaries on Ordered Sets

Definition 2.1. A *(partially) ordered set* is a set $\mathcal{O}$ together with a reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive relation which we denote by $\leq$.

Example 2.2. If $\mathcal{O}$ is an ordered set, every subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ inherits an induced order. For every $x, y \in \mathcal{O}$ we denote by $[x, y] \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ the subset of all $z \in \mathcal{O}$ such that $x \leq z \leq y$. Given $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ we denote by

$$\mathrm{Int}(\mathcal{O}; \mathcal{S}) = \{[x, y] \subseteq \mathcal{O} \,|\, x, y \in \mathcal{S}\}$$

the set of *intervals with endpoints in* $\mathcal{S}$, which we view as an ordered set with respect to inclusion. We use the shorthand notation $\mathrm{Int}(\mathcal{O}) = \mathrm{Int}(\mathcal{O}; \mathcal{O})$ and we write $\mathrm{int}(\mathcal{O})$ for the collection of subsets of $\mathcal{O}$ of the form $[x, z] \setminus \{x, z\}$, for some $[x, z] \in \mathrm{Int}(\mathcal{O})$.

Example 2.3. An *unordered set* is an ordered set with the trivial order with respect to which $x \leq y$ if and only if $x = y$. If $\mathcal{O}$ is an ordered set, we denote by $|\mathcal{O}|$ its underlying unordered set.

Remark 2.4. If $\mathcal{O}$ is an ordered set, we denote by $\mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{op}}$ the *opposite* ordered set such that $|\mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{op}}| = |\mathcal{O}|$ and $x \leq y$ in $\mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{op}}$ if and only if $y \leq x$ in $\mathcal{O}$.

Example 2.5. Given two ordered sets $\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2$, we denote by $\mathcal{O}_1 \times \mathcal{O}_2$ the ordered set such that $|\mathcal{O}_1 \times \mathcal{O}_2| = |\mathcal{O}_1| \times |\mathcal{O}_2|$ with order such that $(x_1, x_2) \leq (y_1, y_2)$ if and only if $x_1 \leq y_1$ and $x_2 \leq y_2$.

Definition 2.6. Let $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ be ordered sets. The set of *order preserving functions from $\mathcal{O}$ to $\mathcal{P}$* is

$$\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}) = \{f : |\mathcal{O}| \to |\mathcal{P}| \,|\, f(x) \leq f(y) \text{ if } x \leq y\}.$$

We view $\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P})$ as an ordered set such that $f \leq g$ if and only if $f(x) \leq g(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{O}$. We use the shorthand notation $\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}) = \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$. We also say that $f \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P})$ is an *embedding* if for any $x, y \in \mathcal{O}$, $f(x) \leq f(y)$ implies $x \leq y$. An *isomorphism* is a surjective embedding. Given an ordered set $\mathcal{O}$, we denote by $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{O})$ the group of all isomorphisms in $\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O})$.

Definition 2.7. If $\mathcal{O}$ is an ordered set, we define its *augmentation* to be the ordered set $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}$ such that

1) $|\widehat{\mathcal{O}}| = |\mathcal{O}| \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$;
2) the canonical inclusion of $|\mathcal{O}|$ into $|\widehat{\mathcal{O}}|$ defines an embedding of $\mathcal{O}$ into $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}$;
3) $\widehat{\mathcal{O}} = [-\infty, +\infty]$.

Definition 2.8. Let $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ be ordered sets. The set of *partially defined functions from $\mathcal{O}$ to $\mathcal{P}$* is

$$\mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{S}} \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P})$$

where $\mathcal{S}$ ranges over all subsets of $\mathcal{O}$. We also write $\mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O})$ for $\mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O})$. If $\psi \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P})$ we denote its domain by $\mathrm{dom}(\psi)$ and its image by $\mathrm{im}(\psi)$. The set of *extensions of ψ* is the subset $\mathrm{OP}_\psi(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}) \subseteq \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P})$ consisting of all functions whose restriction to $\mathrm{dom}(\psi)$ coincides with ψ.

Example 2.9. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an ordered set and let $\mathbf{1}$ be the unique (up to a unique isomorphism) ordered set with one element. Then $\mathrm{PD}(\mathbf{1}, \mathcal{O}) = \mathrm{OP}(\mathbf{1}, \mathcal{O})$ is canonically identified with $\mathcal{O}$.

Definition 2.10. Let $\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}$ be ordered sets. A subset $\Psi \subseteq \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P})$ is *extendable* if for any $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P})$, the restrictions of ψ_1 and ψ_2 to $\mathrm{dom}(\psi_1) \cap \mathrm{dom}(\psi_2)$ coincide. If Ψ is extendable, we define its *common extension* to be $\psi \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P})$ such that

$$\mathrm{dom}(\psi) = \bigcup_{\psi' \in \Psi} \mathrm{dom}(\psi')$$

and $\psi(x) = \psi'(x)$ for every $x \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi')$ and for every $\psi' \in \Psi$.

Remark 2.11. If $\Psi \subseteq \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$ has common extension ψ, then $f \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$ restricts to ψ on $\mathrm{dom}(\psi)$ if and only if f restricts to ψ' on $\mathrm{dom}(\psi')$ for each $\psi' \in \Psi$ i.e.

$$\mathrm{OP}_\psi(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P}) = \bigcap_{\psi' \in \Psi} \mathrm{OP}_{\psi'}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})\,.$$

3. Darboux Sets and Darboux Extensions

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P}$ be ordered sets. We say that $\psi \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$ is *extremal* if there exist $\mathrm{lex}_\psi, \mathrm{uex}_\psi \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$ such that

$$\mathrm{OP}_\psi(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P}) = [\mathrm{lex}_\psi, \mathrm{uex}_\psi]\,.$$

If this is the case, we call lex_ψ (resp. uex_ψ) the *lower extension* (resp. the *upper extension*) of ψ. We denote by $\mathrm{E}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$ the set of all extremal elements of $\mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$.

Example 3.2. Let $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ be ordered sets and let $\psi \in \mathrm{E}(\mathcal{O},\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$ be such that $\mathrm{dom}(\psi) = \{x\}$. Then $\mathrm{lex}_\psi(y) = \psi(x)$ if $x \leq y$ and $\mathrm{lex}_\psi(y) = -\infty$ otherwise. Similarly, $\mathrm{uex}_\psi(y) = \psi(x)$ if $y \leq x$ and $\mathrm{uex}_\psi(y) = +\infty$ otherwise.

Definition 3.3. For each $\psi \in \mathrm{E}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$, we define the *Darboux set of* ψ to be

$$\mathrm{Dar}(\psi) = \{x \in \mathcal{O} \,|\, \mathrm{lex}_\psi(x) = \mathrm{uex}_\psi(x)\}$$

and denote by $\mathrm{ex}_\psi \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$ the *Darboux extension of* ψ i.e. restriction of uex_ψ (or equivalently of lex_ψ) to $\mathrm{Dar}(\psi)$.

Definition 3.4. Given $\psi \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$, the subset of *$\psi$-bounded elements of* $\mathcal{O}$ is the union $\mathrm{B}(\psi)$ of all elements in $\mathrm{Int}(\mathcal{O};\mathrm{dom}(\psi))$. We say that ψ is *encompassing* if $\mathcal{O} = \mathrm{B}(\psi)$. Moreover, for each $\psi \in \mathrm{E}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$ we define the *bounded Darboux set of* ψ to be

$$\mathrm{BDar}(\psi) = \mathrm{Dar}(\psi) \cap \mathrm{B}(\psi)\,.$$

Remark 3.5. Let $\Psi \subseteq \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$ be extendable with common extension $\psi \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$. If each $\psi' \in \Psi$ is encompassing, then ψ is also encompassing as $\mathrm{Int}(\mathcal{O};\mathrm{dom}(\psi')) \subseteq \mathrm{Int}(\mathcal{O};\mathrm{dom}(\psi))$ for any $\psi' \in \Psi$.

Remark 3.6. Let $\Psi \subseteq \mathrm{E}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$ be extendable with common extension $\psi \in \mathrm{E}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$. By Remark 2.11, $f \in [\mathrm{lex}_\psi, \mathrm{uex}_\psi]$ if and only if $f \in [\mathrm{lex}_{\psi'}, \mathrm{uex}_{\psi'}]$ for each $\psi' \in \Psi$. In particular,

$$\{\mathrm{uex}_\psi\} = \bigcap_{\psi' \in \Psi} [\mathrm{uex}_\psi, \mathrm{uex}_{\psi'}] \qquad \text{and} \qquad \{\mathrm{lex}_\psi\} = \bigcap_{\psi' \in \Psi} [\mathrm{lex}_{\psi'}, \mathrm{lex}_\psi]\,.$$

Remark 3.7. If $\psi \in \mathrm{E}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$ and $f \in \mathrm{OP}_{\mathrm{ex}_\psi}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P})$, then f coincides with ψ on $\mathrm{dom}(\psi)$ and thus $\mathrm{lex}_\psi \leq f \leq \mathrm{uex}_\psi$. Since by construction lex_ψ and uex_ψ restrict to ex_ψ on $\mathrm{Dar}(\psi)$, it follows that $\mathrm{OP}_{\mathrm{ex}_\psi}(\mathcal{O},\mathcal{P}) = [\mathrm{lex}_\psi, \mathrm{uex}_\psi]$. In particular $\mathrm{Dar}(\mathrm{ex}_\psi) = \mathrm{Dar}(\psi)$ and $\mathrm{ex}_{\mathrm{ex}_\psi} = \mathrm{ex}_\psi$.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{O}_1$, $\mathcal{O}_2$ and $\mathcal{O}_3$ be ordered sets. Let $\psi_1 \in \mathrm{E}(\mathcal{O}_1,\mathcal{O}_2)$, $\psi_2 \in \mathrm{E}(\mathcal{O}_2,\mathcal{O}_3)$ be such that $\psi_1(\mathrm{dom}(\psi_1)) \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(\psi_2)$ and $\psi_2 \circ \psi_1 \in \mathrm{E}(\mathcal{O}_1,\mathcal{O}_3)$. Then*

i) $\mathrm{lex}_{\psi_2\circ\psi_1} \leq \mathrm{lex}_{\psi_2} \circ \mathrm{lex}_{\psi_1} \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\psi_2} \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\psi_1} \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\psi_2\circ\psi_1}$;

ii) $\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_1}(\mathrm{Dar}(\psi_2 \circ \psi_1) \cap \mathrm{Dar}(\psi_1)) \subseteq \mathrm{Dar}(\psi_2)$*;*
iii) $\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_2} \circ \mathrm{ex}_{\psi_1} = \mathrm{ex}_{\psi_2 \circ \psi_1}$.

Proof: i) is a consequence of the fact that $\mathrm{uex}_{\psi_2} \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\psi_1}$ and $\mathrm{lex}_{\psi_2} \circ \mathrm{lex}_{\psi_1}$ restrict to $\psi_2 \circ \psi_1$ on $\mathrm{dom}(\psi_1)$. If $x \in \mathrm{Dar}(\psi_2 \circ \psi_1) \cap \mathrm{Dar}(\psi_1)$, then i) implies

$$\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_2 \circ \psi_1}(x) = \mathrm{lex}_{\psi_2}(\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_1}(x)) = \mathrm{uex}_{\psi_2}(\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_1}(x))$$

which proves ii) and iii).

Remark 3.9. If $\psi_2 \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}_2, \mathcal{O}_3)$ is an embedding, then Proposition 3.8 implies that $\mathrm{Dar}(\psi_2 \circ \psi_1) \subseteq \mathrm{Dar}(\psi_1)$ and thus $\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_1}(\mathrm{Dar}(\psi_2 \circ \psi_1)) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_2$.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\mathcal{O}$, $\mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{P}'$ be ordered sets and let $\psi \in \mathrm{E}(\mathcal{O}, \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}'))$. Then*

$$\mathrm{ev}_p \circ \mathrm{uex}_\psi = \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{ev}_p \circ \psi} \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{ev}_p \circ \mathrm{lex}_\psi = \mathrm{lex}_{\mathrm{ev}_p \circ \psi}$$

for every $p \in \mathcal{P}$, where $\mathrm{ev}_p \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}'), \mathcal{P}')$ is defined by $\mathrm{ev}_p(f) = f(p)$ for all $f \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}')$.

Proof: Using Proposition 3.8, $\mathrm{ev}_p \circ \mathrm{uex}_\psi = \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{ev}_p} \circ \mathrm{uex}_\psi \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{ev}_p \circ \psi}$. On the other hand, if $g \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}'))$ is such that $\mathrm{ev}_p \circ g = \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{ev}_p \circ \psi}$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$, then $(g(\eta))(p) = \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{ev}_p \circ \psi}(\eta) = (\psi(\eta))(p)$. Therefore, $f \leq \mathrm{uex}_\psi$ which implies $\mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{ev}_p \circ \psi} = \mathrm{ev}_p \circ f \leq \mathrm{ev}_p \circ \mathrm{uex}_\psi$. Hence, $\mathrm{ev}_p \circ \mathrm{uex}_\psi = \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{ev}_p \circ \psi}$. The second equality is proved in a similar way.

Lemma 3.11. *Let $\mathcal{O}$, $\mathcal{P}_1$, $\mathcal{P}_2$ be ordered set, let $\psi \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}_1 \times \mathcal{P}_2)$ and let $\pi_i \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{P}_1 \times \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_i)$ the projections onto each factor. Then ψ is extremal if and only if $\pi_i \circ \psi \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}_i)$ is extremal for $i = 1, 2$. If this is the case, then $\pi_i \circ \mathrm{uex}_\psi = \mathrm{uex}_{\pi_i \circ \psi}$ and $\pi_i \circ \mathrm{lex}_\psi = \mathrm{lex}_{\pi_i \circ \psi}$ for $i = 1, 2$.*

Proof: This follows from the observation that the assignment $f \mapsto (\pi_1 \circ f, \pi_2 \circ f)$ defines a canonical isomorphism

$$\mathrm{OP}_\psi(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}_1 \times \mathcal{P}_2) \cong \mathrm{OP}_{\pi_1 \circ \psi}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}_1) \times \mathrm{OP}_{\pi_2 \circ \psi}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}_2)\,.$$

4. Complete ordered sets

Definition 4.1. An ordered set $\mathcal{P}$ is *complete* if $\mathrm{PD}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}) = \mathrm{E}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}, \widehat{P})$.

Example 4.2. Since the four elements of $\mathrm{PD}(\widehat{\emptyset}) \setminus \mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\emptyset})$ are extremal by Example 4.7, the empty ordered set $\emptyset$ is complete.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a complete ordered set, let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ and let $\psi \in \mathrm{PD}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$ be such that $\mathrm{dom}(\psi) = \mathcal{S}$ and $\psi(s) = s$ for every $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Then*

$$\mathcal{S} \subseteq [\mathrm{uex}_\psi(-\infty), \mathrm{lex}_\psi(+\infty)] = \bigcap_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq [x,y]} [x, y]\,.$$

Proof: For every $s \in S$

$$\mathrm{uex}_\psi(-\infty) \leq \mathrm{uex}_\psi(s) = \mathrm{lex}_\psi(s) \leq \mathrm{lex}_\psi(+\infty)$$

which implies $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [\mathrm{uex}_\psi(-\infty), \mathrm{lex}_\psi(+\infty)]$. If $x, y \in \mathcal{P}$ are such that $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [x, y]$, let $\psi' \in \mathrm{PD}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$ be such that $\mathrm{dom}(\psi') = \widehat{\mathcal{S}}$, $\psi'(-\infty) = x$, $\psi'(+\infty) = y$ and $\psi'(s) = s$ for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Since ψ' restricts to ψ on $\mathcal{S}$, then

$$x = \mathrm{uex}_{\psi'}(-\infty) \leq \mathrm{uex}_\psi(-\infty) \leq \mathrm{lex}_\psi(+\infty) \leq \mathrm{lex}_{\psi'}(-\infty) = y$$

which concludes the proof.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be an ordered set. The following are equivalent*

i) $\mathcal{P}$ is complete;

ii) $\mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}) = \mathrm{E}(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}})$ for every ordered set $\mathcal{O}$;

iii) $\mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}', \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}})) = \mathrm{E}(\mathcal{O}', \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}))$ for every ordered sets $\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}'$.

Proof: Assume that $\mathcal{P}$ is complete and let $\psi \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}})$, $x \in \mathcal{O}$. Consider the subsets

$$\mathcal{S}_x = \{\psi(y) \,|\, y \in [-\infty, x] \cap \mathrm{dom}(\psi)\} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{P}}$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}^x = \{\psi(y) \,|\, y \in [x, +\infty] \cap \mathrm{dom}(\psi)\} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{P}}$$

together with their identity functions $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}_x}, \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}^x} \in \mathrm{PD}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$. Define $l, u \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}})$ such that

$$l(x) = \mathrm{lex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}_x}}(+\infty) \qquad \text{and} \qquad u(x) = \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}^x}}(-\infty)$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{O}$. If $x \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi)$, then $\mathcal{S}_x \subseteq [-\infty, \psi(x)]$ and by Lemma 4.3

$$\psi(x) = \mathrm{lex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}_x}}(\psi(x)) \leq l(x) \leq \psi(x)$$

and thus $l \in \mathrm{OP}_\psi(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}})$. If $f \in \mathrm{OP}_\psi(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}})$, then $\psi(y) = f(y) \leq f(x)$ for any $\psi(y) \in \mathcal{S}_x$. Therefore, $\mathcal{S}_x \subseteq [-\infty, f(x)]$ and by Lemma 4.3, $l(x) \leq f(x)$. Together with a similar argument involving u, this shows that $\mathrm{OP}_\psi(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}) = [l, u]$ and thus ii) is proved. Assume that ii) holds. Consider the canonical embedding α of $\mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}', \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}))$ into $\mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}' \times \mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}})$ defined by $(\alpha(\psi))(x', x) = (\psi(x'))(x)$ for all $(x', x) \in \mathrm{dom}(\alpha(\psi)) = \mathrm{dom}(\psi) \times \mathcal{O}$. The completeness of $\mathcal{P}$ ensures that $\alpha(\psi)$ is extremal and thus $\mathrm{lex}_{\alpha(\psi)} \leq \alpha(f) \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\alpha(\psi)}$ for each $f \in \mathrm{OP}_\psi(\mathcal{O}', \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}))$. Since the restriction of α to $\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}', \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}))$ is an isomorphism, then $\mathrm{lex}_\psi = \alpha^{-1}(\mathrm{lex}_{\alpha(\psi)})$ and $\mathrm{uex}_\psi = \alpha^{-1}(\mathrm{uex}_{\alpha(\psi)})$, which proves iii). Since $\mathrm{OP}(\mathbf{1}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}}) = \widehat{\mathcal{P}}$, iii) implies i) and the proposition is proved.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}$ be ordered sets such that $\mathcal{P}$ is complete, let N be a positive integer and let $\varphi \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}^N)$ be encompassing. Then φ is extremal.*

Proof: By Lemma 3.11, it suffices to prove the $N = 1$ case. Let ψ be the image of φ under the canonical inclusion of $\mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P})$ in $\mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \widehat{\mathcal{P}})$. By assumption, for each $z \in \mathcal{O}$ there exist $x, y \in \mathrm{dom}(\varphi)$ such that $x \leq z \leq y$ and thus

$$\varphi(x) = \psi(x) \leq \mathrm{lex}_\psi(z) \leq \mathrm{uex}_\psi(z) \leq \psi(y) = \varphi(y)\,.$$

Therefore, φ is extremal.

Example 4.6. Given an ordered set $\mathcal{O}$, we define its *dual* to be $\mathcal{O}^\vee = \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{op}}, \widehat{\emptyset})$. Then $\mathcal{O}^\vee \setminus \{\pm\infty\}$ is a complete ordered set. Here $\pm\infty$ denotes the constant function such that $\mathrm{im}(\pm\infty) = \{\pm\infty\}$.

Example 4.7. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an ordered set, $\mathcal{P}$ a complete ordered set and let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$. Let $\psi_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}), \widehat{\mathcal{P}})$ be such that $\mathrm{dom}(\psi_{\mathcal{S}}) \subseteq \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P})$ is the subset of functions that are constant on $\mathcal{S}$ and $\psi_{\mathcal{S}}(f) = f(x)$ for every $f \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi_{\mathcal{S}})$ and every $x \in \mathcal{S}$. Since ev_x coincides with $\psi_{\mathcal{S}}$ on $\mathrm{dom}(\psi_{\mathcal{S}})$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$, then $\mathrm{ev}_x \in [\mathrm{lex}_{\psi_{\mathcal{S}}}, \mathrm{uex}_{\psi_{\mathcal{S}}}]$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$. In particular, $\mathrm{dom}(\psi_{\mathcal{S}}) = \mathrm{Dar}(\psi_{\mathcal{S}})$.

Remark 4.8. Assume $\psi_{\mathcal{S}}$ is as in Example 4.7 and $\mathcal{O}$ is unordered. For every $f \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P})$ and $y \in \mathcal{P}$, let $f_y \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi_{\mathcal{S}})$ be the function whose restriction to $\mathcal{O} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ coincides with f and such that $f_y(x) = y$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$. In particular, if there exists $y, z \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $f(x) \in [y, z]$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$, then $f \in [f_y, f_z]$ and thus $[\mathrm{lex}_{\psi_{\mathcal{S}}}, \mathrm{uex}_{\psi_{\mathcal{S}}}] \subseteq [y, z]$. Moreover, Lemma 4.5 the restriction $\varphi_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathrm{B}(\psi_{\mathcal{S}}), \mathcal{P})$ of the function $\psi_{\mathcal{S}}$ defined in Example 4.7 to $\mathrm{B}(\psi)$ is extremal.

5. Completely Integrally Closed Subgroups

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{O}$, $\mathcal{O}'$ be ordered set and let $\mathcal{P}$ be a complete ordered set. If $\psi \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}))$, $\psi' \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}', \mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}))$ are such that $\mathrm{im}(\psi), \mathrm{im}(\psi') \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$, then*

$$\mu \circ (\mathrm{uex}_\psi \times \mathrm{uex}_{\psi'}) = \mathrm{uex}_{\mu \circ (\psi \times \psi')} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu \circ (\mathrm{lex}_\psi \times \mathrm{lex}_{\psi'}) = \mathrm{lex}_{\mu \circ (\psi \times \psi')}\,.$$

Here $\mu \in \mathrm{OP}((\mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}))^2, \mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}))$ is the composition defined by $\mu(\varphi, \varphi') = \varphi \circ \varphi'$ for all $\varphi, \varphi' \in \mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$.

Proof: Since the restriction of $\mu \circ (\mathrm{uex}_\psi \times \mathrm{uex}_{\psi'})$ to $\mathrm{dom}(\psi \times \psi')$ coincides with $\mu \circ (\psi \times \psi')$, then $\mu \circ (\mathrm{uex}_\psi \times \mathrm{uex}_{\psi'}) \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mu \circ (\psi \times \psi')}$. On the other hand, if $\eta \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi)$ is fixed, then $(\psi(\eta))^{-1} \mathrm{uex}_{\mu \circ (\psi \times \psi')}(\eta, \eta') = \psi'(\eta')$ for every $\eta' \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi')$. It follows that

$$\mathrm{uex}_{\mu \circ (\psi \times \psi')}(\eta, x') \leq \psi(\eta) \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\psi'}(x') = \mu \circ (\mathrm{uex}_\psi \times \mathrm{uex}_{\psi'})(\eta, x') \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mu \circ (\psi \times \psi')}(\eta, x')$$

for all $(\eta, x') \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi) \times \mathcal{O}'$. Setting $q = (\mathrm{uex}_{\psi'}(x'))\,(p)$ yields

$$\mathrm{ev}_p \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\mu \circ (\psi \times \psi')}(\eta, x) = (\psi(\eta))(q) = \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{ev}_q \circ \psi}(\eta)$$

for every $p \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}$ and for every $\eta \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi)$. Lemma 3.10 then implies

$$\mathrm{ev}_p \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\mu \circ (\psi \times \psi')}(x, x') \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{ev}_q \circ \psi}(x) = \mathrm{ev}_q \circ \mathrm{uex}_\psi(x) = \mathrm{ev}_p \circ \mu \circ (\mathrm{uex}_\psi \times \mathrm{uex}_{\psi'})(x, x')$$

for all $p \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}$ and and all $(x, x') \in \mathcal{O} \times \mathcal{O}'$, which proves the first equality in the statement of the Proposition. The second equality is proved similarly.

Definition 5.2. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an ordered set. A subgroup $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O})$ is *completely integrally closed* for every $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$, $a^n \leq a'$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ implies $a \leq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{P}}$.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a complete ordered set and let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$ be a completely integrally closed subgroup. Then* $\mathrm{BDar}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})$ *is a subgroup of* $\mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$.

Proof: Since the restrictions of $\mathrm{lex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}} \circ \mu$ and $\mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}} \circ \mu$ to $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$ coincides with $\mu \circ (\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}} \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})$, we obtain

$$\mathrm{lex}_{\mu\circ(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})} \leq \mathrm{lex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}} \circ \mu \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}} \circ \mu \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mu\circ(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})} = \mathrm{uex}_{\mu\circ(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})} \tag{1}$$

By Proposition 5.1, we conclude that these inequalities restrict to an equalities on $\mathrm{Dar}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}) \times \mathrm{Dar}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})$. Hence $\mathrm{Dar}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})$ is a subsemigroup of $\mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$. Given $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathrm{BDar}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})$, by definition there exist $a_i, a_i' \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $a_i \leq \varphi_i \leq a_i'$ for $i = 1, 2$. Therefore $a_1 \circ a_2 \leq \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2 \leq a_1' \circ a_2'$ and thus $\mathrm{BDar}(\psi)$ is also a subsemigroup. In order to construct inverses, consider $\psi \in \mathrm{PD}((\mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}))^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}))$ such that $\mathrm{dom}(\psi) = \mathcal{A}$ and $\psi(a) = a^{-1}$ for every $a \in \mathcal{A}$. By Proposition 5.1,

$$\mathrm{lex}_{\mu\circ(\psi\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})}(\varphi, \varphi) = \mathrm{lex}_{\psi}(\varphi) \circ \varphi \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mu\circ(\psi\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})}(\varphi, \varphi)$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathrm{Dar}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})$. Using Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 3.8 we obtain

$$\mathrm{lex}_{\psi}(\varphi) \circ \varphi \leq \mathrm{lex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}}\left(\mathrm{uex}_{\mu\circ(\psi\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})}(\varphi, \varphi)\right). \tag{2}$$

Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{BDar}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$ be such that $a \leq \varphi$ and $a' \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mu\circ(\psi\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})}(\varphi, \varphi)$. Then

$$a \circ a' \leq a \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\mu\circ(\psi\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})}(\varphi, \varphi) \leq a \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\mu\circ(\psi\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})}(a, \varphi) = \varphi$$

and thus $a \circ (a')^n \leq \varphi$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is completely integrally closed, this implies $a' \leq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{P}}$. Together with a similar argument involving $\mathrm{lex}_{\mu\circ(\psi\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})}$, we conclude that

$$\mathrm{lex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}}\left(\mathrm{uex}_{\mu\circ(\psi\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})}(\varphi, \varphi)\right) \leq \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{P}} \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}}\left(\mathrm{lex}_{\mu\circ(\psi\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})}(\varphi, \varphi)\right).$$

Therefore, applying $\mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}}$ to Equation (2) and using Proposition 3.8 yields

$$\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{P}} \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}}\left(\mathrm{lex}_{\mu\circ(\psi\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})}(\varphi, \varphi)\right) \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathrm{lex}_{\psi}(\varphi)) \circ \varphi \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{P}}) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{P}}$$

since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{A}$. Hence φ has a left inverse. A similar argument shows that it has right inverse, which concludes the proof.

Corollary 5.4. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a complete ordered set and let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$ be a commutative completely integrally closed subgroup. Then* $\mathrm{BDar}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})$ *is a commutative subgroup of* $\mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$.

Proof: Let $\mu' \in \mathrm{OP}((\mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}))^2, \mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}}))$ denotes composition in reverse order i.e. $\mu'(\varphi, \varphi') = \varphi' \circ \varphi$, for all $\varphi, \varphi' \in \mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathcal{P}})$. Since the restrictions of $\mathrm{lex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}} \circ \mu'$ and $\mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}} \circ \mu'$ to $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$ coincides with $\mu \circ (\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}} \times \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})$, we obtain

$$\mathrm{lex}_{\mu\circ(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})} \leq \mathrm{lex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}} \circ \mu' \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}} \circ \mu' \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mu\circ(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}\times\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})}.$$

Together with Equation (1), this implies the commutativity of the semigroup $\mathrm{Dar}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}})$.

6. The Darboux Completion

Remark 6.1. For each $x \in \mathcal{O}$, let $\delta_x \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{op}}, \widehat{\emptyset})$ be such that $\mathrm{dom}(\delta_x) = \{x\}$ and $\delta_x(x) = +\infty$. Then $\mathrm{lex}_{\delta_x}(y) = +\infty$ if and only if $y \leq x$. Let us denote $Y(x) = \mathrm{lex}_{\delta_x}$ for every $x \in \mathcal{O}$. If $f \in \mathcal{O}^\vee$ then $f(x) = +\infty$ if and only if $Y(x) \leq f$. Moreover, $f \leq g$ in $\mathcal{O}^\vee$ if and only if $Y(x) \leq f$ implies $Y(x) \leq g$. In particular, $Y(x) \leq Y(y)$ if and only if $x \leq y$. Hence the assignment $x \mapsto Y(x)$ defines an embedding $Y \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}^\vee)$ called the *Yoneda embedding of* $\mathcal{O}$.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an ordered set. If $\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{im}(Y)} \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}^\vee)$ denotes the restriction of $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}^\vee}$ to the image of the Yoneda embedding, then $\mathrm{lex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{im}(Y)}} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}^\vee}$ and $\mathrm{Dar}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{im}(Y)}) \setminus \{\pm\infty\}$ is complete.*

Proof: Let $\varphi = \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{im}(Y)}$. Since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}^\vee}$ restricts to φ on $\mathrm{im}(Y)$, then $\mathrm{lex}_\varphi(f) \leq f$ for every $f \in \mathcal{O}^\vee$. On the other hand, $Y(x) \leq f$ implies $Y(x) = \mathrm{lex}_\varphi(Y(x)) \leq \mathrm{lex}_\varphi(f)$. Using Remark 6.1, this implies $\mathrm{lex}_\varphi = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}^\vee}$. In particular, uex_φ and lex_φ both restrict to the identity on $\mathrm{Dar}(\varphi)$. Let $\psi \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathrm{Dar}(\varphi))$ and let ψ' be the composition of ψ with the canonical inclusion of $\mathrm{Dar}(\varphi)$ in $\mathcal{O}^\vee$. Then $\mathrm{uex}_\varphi \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\psi'}$ and $\mathrm{uex}_\varphi \circ \mathrm{lex}_{\psi'}$ both restrict to ψ on $\mathrm{dom}(\psi)$. If $g \in \mathrm{OP}_\psi(\mathrm{Dar}(\varphi), \mathrm{Dar}(\varphi))$, then $\mathrm{lex}_{\psi'} \leq g \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\psi'}$. Since $\mathrm{uex}_\varphi \circ g = g$, this implies $\mathrm{uex}_\varphi \circ \mathrm{lex}_{\psi'} \leq g \leq \mathrm{uex}_\varphi \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\psi'}$ and thus ψ is extremal.

Definition 6.3. We denote by $\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})$ the Darboux set of $\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{im}(Y)}$ and refer to $\mathrm{Dar}'(\mathcal{O}) = \mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O}) \setminus \{\pm\infty\}$ as the *Darboux completion of* $\mathcal{O}$. We also denote by $\mathrm{BDar}(\mathcal{O})$ the bounded Darboux set of $\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{im}(Y)}$.

Corollary 6.4. *An ordered set $\mathcal{O}$ is complete if and only if* $\mathrm{im}(Y) = \mathrm{Dar}'(\mathcal{O})$.

Proof: Since Y is an embedding and $\mathrm{Dar}'(\mathcal{O})$ is complete, then $\mathrm{im}(Y) = \mathrm{Dar}'(\mathcal{O})$ implies that $\mathcal{O}$ is complete. Conversely, if $\mathcal{O}$ is complete, then $\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{im}(Y)}$ factors as $\psi_2 \circ \psi_1$, where $\psi_1 \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}^\vee, \mathrm{im}(Y) \cup \{\pm\infty\})$ is such that $\psi_1(x) = x$ for all $x \in \mathrm{im}(Y)$ and ψ_2 is the canonical embedding of $\mathrm{im}(Y)$ into $\mathcal{O}^\vee$. Since ψ_1 and ψ_2 are both extremal, Remark 3.9 and Proposition 3.8 imply that $f = \mathrm{ex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{im}(Y)}}(f) = \mathrm{ex}_{\psi_1}(f) \in \mathrm{im}(Y) \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ for every $f \in \mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})$. Since $\mathrm{im}(Y) \subseteq \mathrm{Dar}'(\mathcal{O})$ for every ordered set $\mathcal{O}$, then $\mathrm{im}(Y) \cup \{\pm\infty\} = \mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})$ which completes the proof.

Remark 6.5. From now on we use the Yoneda embedding to canonically identify $\mathcal{O}$ with a subset of $\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O}) \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\vee$. In particular, this provides a canonical embedding of $\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O})$ into $\mathrm{PD}(\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})) \subseteq \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}^\vee)$.

Example 6.6. Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be the ordered set of rational numbers with its standard order. We define $\mathbb{R} = \mathrm{BDar}(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathrm{Dar}'(\mathbb{Q})$ to be the set of *real numbers*. In particular, $\mathrm{Dar}(\mathbb{Q}) = \widehat{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ is naturally identified with the set of *extended real numbers*.

Example 6.7. Let $\mathbb{Q}_{>0} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ be the ordered set of positive rational numbers and let $\mathbb{R}_{>0} = \mathrm{BDar}(\mathbb{Q}_{>0})$. Extending each function in $\mathrm{BDar}(\mathbb{Q}_{>0})$ by $+\infty$ to $\mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ yields a canonical embedding of $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ into $\mathbb{R}$ whose image consists of real numbers that are greater than $Y(0)$.

Moreover, the composition of this embedding with the canonical embedding of $\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ into $\mathrm{BDar}(\mathbb{Q}_{>0})$ coincides with the restriction of the canonical embedding of $\mathbb{Q}$ into $\mathbb{R}$. Keeping in mind the above canonical identifications, it makes sense to write equalities such as $\mathbb{Q}_{>0} = \mathbb{Q} \cap \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

Remark 6.8. Using the convention of Remark 6.5, consider $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}}, \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})} \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}^{\vee})$. Since $\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})}$ restricts to $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}}$ on $\mathcal{O}$, we have $\mathrm{lex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}}} \leq \mathrm{lex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})}} \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})}} \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}}}$. Since by definition the first and the last term coincide on $\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})$, we obtain $\mathrm{ex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}}} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})}$. As a consequence, if $\varphi \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O}))$ restricts to the identity on $\mathcal{O}$, then $\mathrm{lex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}}} \leq \mathrm{lex}_{\varphi} \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\varphi} \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{O}}}$ which implies that $\varphi = \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})}$. In other words $\mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})}$ is the only endomorphism of $\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})$ that restricts to the identity on $\mathcal{O}$.

Proposition 6.9. *There exists a canonical embedding $\alpha \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{O}), \mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})))$. Moreover, α is a group homomorphism.*

Proof: Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{O}) \subseteq \mathrm{PD}(\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O}))$. Then $\mathrm{lex}_{\varphi^{-1}} \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\varphi} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O})}$ by Remark 6.8. This implies that uex_{φ} is invertible and $\mathrm{uex}_{\varphi} \leq \mathrm{lex}_{\varphi} \circ \mathrm{lex}_{\varphi^{-1}} \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\varphi} \leq \mathrm{lex}_{\varphi}$. Therefore, $\mathrm{ex}_{\varphi} \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{Dar}(\mathcal{O}))$. Let $\alpha(\varphi) = \mathrm{ex}_{\varphi}$ for all $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{O})$. Combining Remark 6.8 and Proposition 3.8, we conclude that α is an injective group homomorphism and the Proposition is proved.

Example 6.10. Addition in $\mathbb{Q}$ defines an embedding $\lambda \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathbb{Q}, \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{Q}))$ such that $(\lambda(r))(s) = r + s$ for all $r, s \in \mathbb{Q}$. Composing with α we obtain an embedding $\beta \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathbb{Q}, \mathrm{Aut}(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}))$. Since every (order preserving) automorphism of $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ necessarily fixes $\pm\infty$, we have a canonical identification of $\mathrm{Aut}(\widehat{\mathbb{R}})$ with $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{R})$. In particular, $(\beta(x))(\pm\infty) = \pm\infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Proposition 6.11. $\mathbb{R}$ *is canonically isomorphic to* $\mathrm{BDar}(\mathrm{id}_{\beta}(\mathbb{Q}))$.

Proof: Considering β as an element of $\mathrm{PD}(\mathbb{R}, \mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}))$, we obtain $\mathrm{lex}_{\beta}, \mathrm{uex}_{\beta} \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathbb{R}, \mathrm{OP}(\widehat{\mathbb{R}}))$. $\mathrm{ev}_0 \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathrm{BDar}(\mathrm{id}_{\beta}(\mathbb{Q})), \mathbb{R})$ is surjective by Remark 6.8 since $\mathrm{ev}_0 \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\beta}$ and $\mathrm{ev}_0 \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\beta}$ both restrict to the identity on $\mathbb{Q}$. Since $\mathrm{lex}_{\beta} \circ \mathrm{ev}_0$ and $\mathrm{uex}_{\beta} \circ \mathrm{ev}_0$ both restrict to the identity on $\beta(\mathbb{Q})$, they both equal to the identity on $\mathrm{BDar}(\mathrm{id}_{\beta}(\mathbb{Q}))$. Therefore ev_0 is invertible with inverse ex_{β}.

Remark 6.12. By Corollary 5.4 we conclude that $\mathbb{R}$ has a canonical structure of commutative group. Alternatively, this structure can be understood as follows. Let $+ \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathbb{R}^2, \widehat{\mathbb{R}})$ be the addition operation on $\mathbb{Q}$. Since $(\mathrm{ex}_{\beta}(r))(s) = r + s$ for all $r, s \in \mathbb{Q}$, we obtain

$$\mathrm{lex}_{+}(x, y) \leq (\mathrm{ex}_{\beta}(x))(y) \leq \mathrm{uex}_{+}(x, y) \tag{3}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, for every $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ both $\mathrm{ex}_{\beta}(r)^{-1} \circ \mathrm{uex}_{+}(r, -)$ and $\mathrm{ex}_{\beta}(r)^{-1} \circ \mathrm{lex}_{+}(r, -)$ restrict to the identity of $\mathbb{Q}$. By Remark 6.8, this implies $\mathrm{lex}_{+}(r, -) = \mathrm{ex}_{\beta}(r) = \mathrm{uex}_{+}(r, -)$ for all $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ and thus $\mathrm{lex}_{\beta}(x) \leq \mathrm{lex}_{+}(x, -) \leq \mathrm{uex}_{+}(x, -) \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\beta}(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence the inequalities of (3) are actually equalities for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 6.13. A similar argument shows that the multiplication $\bullet \in \mathrm{PD}((\mathbb{R}_{>0})^2, \mathbb{R}_{>0})$ of positive rational numbers defines an embedding $\gamma \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathbb{Q}_{>0}, \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{R}_{>0}))$ such that $(\mathrm{ex}_{\gamma}(x))(y) = \mathrm{ex}_{\bullet}(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

Theorem 6.14. $(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \mathrm{ex}_+, \mathrm{ex}_\bullet)$ *is a semifield.*

Proof: Let $\psi \in \mathrm{PD}((\mathbb{R}_{>0})^3, \mathbb{R}_{>0})$ be such that $\mathrm{dom}(\psi) = (\mathbb{Q}_{>0})^3$ and $\psi(r,s,t) = r(s+t)$ for all $r,s,t \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$. Since $\mathrm{ex}_\bullet(r, \mathrm{ex}_+(s,t)) = \psi(r,s,t)$ for all $r,s,t \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, then

$$\mathrm{lex}_\psi(x,y,z) \leq \mathrm{ex}_\bullet(x, \mathrm{ex}_+(y,z)) \leq \mathrm{uex}_\psi(x,y,z) \tag{4}$$

for all $x,y,z \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. On the other hand, since $\gamma(s+t)$ agrees with both $\mathrm{lex}_\psi(-,s,t)$ and $\mathrm{uex}_\psi(-,s,t)$ on $\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ for all $s,t \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, they also agree on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Using $(\gamma(s+t))(x) = \mathrm{ex}_\bullet(x, s+t) = (\mathrm{ex}_\gamma(x))(s+t)$, we obtain

$$\mathrm{lex}_+(y,z) \leq (\mathrm{ex}_\gamma(x))^{-1}\mathrm{lex}_\psi(x,y,z) \leq (\mathrm{ex}_\gamma(x))^{-1}\mathrm{uex}_\psi(x,y,z) \leq \mathrm{uex}_+(y,z)\,.$$

Since $\mathrm{ex}_\bullet(x, \mathrm{ex}_+(y,z)) = (\mathrm{ex}_\gamma(x))(\mathrm{ex}_+(y,z))$ for all $x,y,z \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we conclude that the equalities of (4) are in fact equalities. It follows from the distributivity of $\bullet$ over $+$ on $\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ that $\mathrm{ex}_+(\mathrm{ex}_\bullet(r,t), \mathrm{ex}_\bullet(r,t)) = \psi(r,s,t)$ for all $r,s,t \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$. Hence, $\mathrm{ex}_\bullet$ distributes over ex_+ on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and the theorem is proved.

Remark 6.15. A standard argument shows that $\mathrm{ex}_\bullet$ can be canonically extended to an operation (which is not order-preserving) $\cdot$ on $\mathbb{R}$ in such a way that $(\mathbb{R}, \mathrm{ex}_+, \cdot)$ is a field. With a slight abuse of notation, from now on we write $+$ for ex_+. Since $(\beta(x))(\pm\infty) = \pm\infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Q}$, we set $x + (\pm\infty) = \pm\infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 6.16. For each ordered set $\mathcal{O}$, the set $\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R})$ inherits a canonical structure of $\mathbb{R}$-algebra with operations defined pointwise on $\mathcal{O}$. In particular, $f_1 \leq f_2$ implies $f_1 + f_3 \leq f_2 + f_3$ for any $f_1, f_2, f_3 \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R})$ and $f_1 f_3 \leq f_2 f_3$ whenever $0 \geq f_3$.

7. Limits and Integrals

Definition 7.1. A *filter basis* on an ordered set $\mathcal{O}$ is a collection F of nonempty subsets of $\mathcal{O}$ that is closed under finite intersections. To each filter basis F of $\mathcal{O}$ we associate the partially defined function $\psi_F \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R}), \widehat{\mathbb{R}})$ such that

$$\mathrm{dom}(\psi_F) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{S} \in F} \mathrm{dom}(\psi_{\mathcal{S}})\,,$$

where $\psi_{\mathcal{S}}$ is defined as in Example 4.7 and $\psi_F(f) = \psi_{\mathcal{S}}(f)$ for each $f \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi_{\mathcal{S}})$ and for each $\mathcal{S} \in F$.

Definition 7.2. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an unordered set and let F be a filter basis on $\mathcal{O}$. A function $f \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R})$ is *F-convergent* if there exists $\lim_F(f) \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\mathcal{S} \in F$ such that $f(x) \in [\lim_F(f) - \varepsilon, \lim_F(f) + \varepsilon]$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$.

Theorem 7.3. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an unordered set and let F be a filter basis on $\mathcal{O}$. A function $f \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R})$ is F-convergent if and only if $f \in \mathrm{Dar}(\psi_F)$. Moreover, $\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_F}(f) = \lim_F(f)$ for all $f \in \mathrm{Dar}(\psi_F)$.*

Proof: Assume that $f \in \mathrm{Dar}(\psi_F)$. Then by Remark 2.11 for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{S}'' \in F$ such that $[\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_F}(f), \mathrm{ex}_{\psi_{\mathcal{S}'}}(f)] \subseteq [\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_F}(f), \mathrm{ex}_{\psi_F}(f)+\varepsilon]$ and $[\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_{\mathcal{S}''}}(f), \mathrm{ex}_{\psi_F}(f)] \subseteq [\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_F}(f)-\varepsilon, \mathrm{ex}_{\psi_F}(f)]$. Therefore, setting $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}' \cap \mathcal{S}''$ we obtain

$$\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_F}(f) - \varepsilon \leq \mathrm{lex}_{\psi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f) \leq f(x) \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\psi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f) \leq \mathrm{ex}_{\psi_F}(f) + \varepsilon$$

for every $x \in \mathcal{S}$. Hence f is F-convergent and $\lim_F(f) = \mathrm{ex}_{\psi_F}(f)$. Conversely, if f is F-convergent, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\mathcal{S} \in F$ such that $\lim_F(f) - \varepsilon \leq f(x) \leq \lim_F(f) + \varepsilon$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$. Using Remark 4.8, this implies

$$[\mathrm{lex}_{\psi_F}(f), \mathrm{uex}_{\psi_F}(f)] \subseteq [\mathrm{lex}_{\psi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f), \mathrm{uex}_{\psi_{\mathcal{S}}}(f)] \subseteq [\lim_F(f) - \varepsilon, \lim_F(f) + \varepsilon]$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$. Hence, $f \in \mathrm{Dar}(\psi_F)$ and $\lim_F(f) = \mathrm{ex}_{\psi_F}(f)$.

Remark 7.4. In terms of the philosophy outlined in Section 1, the functions in $\mathrm{dom}(\psi_F)$, i.e. the functions that are constant on some element of F are "obviously F-convergent" and ψ_F is their "obvious limit". Feeding the machinery of Darboux calculus with this information results in a construction of general F-convergent functions that is alternative to the (ε, δ)-definition given in 7.2

Example 7.5. Let $\mathbb{N}$ be the set of natural numbers with its usual order. Let $\mathcal{O} = |\mathbb{N}|$ and let $F = \{\mathbb{N} \setminus [1, n]\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then $\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R})$ is the set of all sequences, $\mathrm{dom}(\psi_F)$ is the set of sequences that are eventually constant and $\psi_F(f)$ is the function that to such a sequence assigns its obvious limit i.e. the only value that f attains infinitely many times. Moreover, $\mathrm{Dar}(\psi_F)$ is precisely the set of all convergent sequences (including those converging to $\pm\infty$) and ex_{ψ_F} is their limit.

Example 7.6. Let $\mathcal{O} = |\mathbb{R}|$, let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and let F be the collection of all subsets of the form $[x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta]$ for some $\delta > 0$. Then $\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R})$ is the set of all real-valued functions of one real variable, $\mathrm{dom}(\psi_F)$ is the subset of functions that are constant in a neighborhood of x_0 and $\psi_F(f) = f(x_0)$ for all $f \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi_F)$. Moreover, $\mathrm{Dar}(\psi_F)$ is precisely the set of all functions that are continuous at x_0 and $\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_F}(f) = f(x_0)$ for all $f \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi_F)$.

Example 7.7. In the notation of Example 7.6, we could also consider F to be the collection of all subsets of the form $[x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta] \setminus \{x_0\}$ for some $\delta > 0$. Then $f \in \mathrm{Dar}(\psi_F)$ if an only if f has limit at x_0 in which case $\mathrm{ex}_{\psi_F}(f)$ equals the limit. We leave the obvious variations leading to left and right limits to the reader.

Example 7.8. For any $J \in \mathrm{Int}(\mathbb{R})$, let $m \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathrm{int}(J), \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$ be defined by $m([x, z] \setminus \{x, z\}) = z - x$ whenever $x \leq z$ and 0 otherwise. Given $J \in \mathrm{Int}(\mathbb{R})$, let $\mathrm{Par}(J)$ be the collection of *partitions* of J i.e. finite collections $P \subseteq \mathrm{int}(J)$ of mutually disjoint subsets such that $J \setminus \bigcup_{I \in P} I$ is finite. For each $I \in \mathrm{int}(J)$, let $\psi_I \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathrm{OP}(|J|, \mathbb{R}), \widehat{\mathbb{R}})$ be as in Example 4.7. In particular, the set of all bounded $\mathbb{R}$-valued functions on J coincides with

$$\mathcal{O} = B(\psi_J) = \bigcap_{I \in P} B(\psi_I)$$

for any $P \in \mathrm{Par}(J)$. Let $\varphi_I \in \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{B}(\psi_I), \mathbb{R})$ be defined as in Remark 4.8 for each $I \in \mathrm{int}(J)$ and let $U_P, L_P \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R})$ be such that

$$U_P = \sum_{I \in P} m(I) \mathrm{uex}_{\varphi_I} \quad \text{and} \quad L_P = \sum_{I \in P} m(I) \mathrm{lex}_{\varphi_I} .$$

By Remark 4.8 it is clear that for each $f \in \mathcal{O}$, $U_P(f)$ coincides with the usual *upper Darboux sums* of f and $L_P(f)$ coincides with the usual *lower Darboux sums* of f (see e.g.[4]). On the other hand, for each $P \in \mathrm{Par}(J)$ can we define $\varphi_P \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\varphi_P(f) = \sum_{I \in P} m(I) \varphi_I(f) \tag{5}$$

for each element f of

$$\mathrm{dom}(\varphi_P) = \bigcap_{I \in P} \mathrm{dom}(\varphi_I) .$$

Since φ_P is clearly encompassing, it is also extremal by Corollary 4.5. Moreover,

$$\mathrm{lex}_{\varphi_P} \leq L_P \leq U_P \leq \mathrm{uex}_{\varphi_P} \tag{6}$$

as each term in the above chain of inequalities restricts to φ_P on $\mathrm{dom}(\varphi_P)$. Since each function in $\mathcal{O}$ attains only finitely many values, then $\mathrm{dom}(\varphi_P) \cong \mathbb{R}^N$ for some integer N. In particular, Corollary 4.5 ensures that if $\rho_P \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathrm{dom}(\varphi_P))$ denotes the identity function on $\mathrm{dom}(\varphi_P)$ then ρ_P is extremal. Therefore

$$\mathrm{uex}_{\varphi_P} \leq \varphi_P \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\rho_P} = \sum_{I \in P} m(I)(\varphi_I \circ \mathrm{uex}_{\rho_P}) \leq \sum_{I \in P} m(I) \mathrm{uex}_{\varphi_I \circ \rho_P} = U_P . \tag{7}$$

Combined with an analogous estimate for lex_{φ_P} and (6), (7) shows that $\mathrm{uex}_{\varphi_P} = U_P$ and $\mathrm{lex}_{\varphi_P} = L_P$. Since $m(I) = m(I_1) + m(I_2)$ whenever $I \setminus (I_1 \cup I_2)$ is finite and $I \subseteq I'$ implies $\varphi_I(f) = \varphi_{I'}(f)$ for each $f \in \mathrm{dom}(\varphi'_I)$, then for each $f \in \mathrm{dom}(\varphi_P) \cap \mathrm{dom}(\varphi_{P'})$

$$\varphi_P(f) = \sum_{I \in P} m(I) \varphi_I(f) = \sum_{I \in P} \sum_{I' \in P'} m(I \cap I') \varphi_{I \cap I'}(f) = \sum_{I' \in \mathcal{P}'} m(I') \varphi_{I'}(f) = \varphi_{P'}(f) .$$

Therefore the collection $\{\varphi_P\}_{P \in \mathrm{Par}(J)} \subseteq \mathrm{PD}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R})$ is extendable and we denote by φ its common extension. In particular, $\mathrm{dom}(\varphi)$ is the set of *step functions on* J i.e. the set of all functions on $|J|$ that are constant on each interval of some partition of J. Combining 3.5 with Corollary 4.5 we conclude that φ is encompassing and thus extremal. By Remark 3.6

$$\mathrm{OP}_{\varphi}(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R}) = \bigcap_{P \in \mathrm{Par}(J)} [\mathrm{lex}_{\varphi_P}, \mathrm{uex}_{\varphi_P}] = \bigcap_{P \in \mathrm{Par}(J)} [L_P, U_P]$$

and thus lex_{φ}, uex_{φ} coincide with the lower and upper integral of f on J, respectively. In particular, $\mathrm{Dar}(\varphi)$ coincides with the set of functions on J that are integrable in the sense of Riemann and ex_{φ} is the Riemann integral. This is in fact the motivating example for the philosophy of Section 1: to define the Riemann integral it is sufficient to feed the "obvious" definition for step functions (given by (5)) into the machinery of Darboux calculus to automatically obtain the correct general definition.

Theorem 7.9 (Linearity)**.** *Let* $\psi \in \mathrm{PD}(\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R}),\mathbb{R})$ *be such that*
1) ψ *is encompassing;*
2) $\mathrm{dom}(\psi)$ *is a subspace of* $\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R})$*;*
3) ψ *is a linear transformation.*
Then for every $f_1, f_2 \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R})$ *and for every non-negative* $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathrm{uex}_\psi(a_1 f_1 + a_2 f_2) \leq a_1 \mathrm{uex}_\psi(f_1) + a_2 \mathrm{uex}_\psi(f_2) \tag{8}$$

and similarly

$$a_1 \mathrm{lex}_\psi(f_1) + a_2 \mathrm{lex}_\psi(f_2) \leq \mathrm{lex}_\psi(a_1 f_1 + a_2 f_2)\,. \tag{9}$$

Moreover

$$-\mathrm{lex}_\psi(f) = \mathrm{uex}_\psi(-f) \tag{10}$$

for every $f \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R})$*. In particular,* $\mathrm{Dar}(\psi)$ *is a subspace of* $\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R})$ *and* ex_ψ *is linear.*

Proof: Since ψ is encompassing, it is extremal. By the additivity of ψ, the assignment $f_1 \mapsto \mathrm{uex}_\psi(f_1+\eta_2)-\psi(\eta_2)$ coincides with ψ on $\mathrm{dom}(\psi)$ for each fixed $\eta_2 \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi)$. Therefore

$$\mathrm{uex}_\psi(f_1 + \eta_2) \leq \mathrm{uex}_\psi(f_1) + \psi(\eta_2) \tag{11}$$

for every $f_1 \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R})$ and for every $\eta_2 \in \mathrm{dom}(\psi)$. In particular

$$\mathrm{uex}_\psi(f_1) + \psi(\eta_2) = \mathrm{uex}_\psi((f_1 + \eta_2) + (-\eta_2)) + \psi(\eta_2) \leq \mathrm{uex}_\psi(f_1 + \eta_2)$$

and thus the inequality in (11) is actually an equality. Therefore, for each $f_1 \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R})$ the assignment $f_2 \mapsto \mathrm{uex}_\psi(f_1+f_2)-\mathrm{uex}_\psi(f_1)$ coincides with ψ on $\mathrm{dom}(\psi)$. This proves (8) when $a_1 = a_2 = 1$. Since ψ is compatible with scalar multiplication, a is a positive real number the assignment $f \mapsto a^{-1}\mathrm{uex}_\psi(af)$ coincides with ψ on $\mathrm{dom}(\psi)$. Therefore, $\mathrm{uex}_\psi(af) \leq a\mathrm{uex}_\psi(f)$ which in turn implies

$$a\mathrm{uex}_\psi(f) = a\mathrm{uex}_\psi(a^{-1}(af)) \leq \mathrm{uex}_\psi(af)$$

As a result, $a\mathrm{uex}_\psi(f) = \mathrm{uex}_\psi(af)$ for ever positive real number a and for every $f \in \mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R})$. This proves (8) and (9) is proved similarly. Since ψ is odd, the assignments $f \mapsto -\mathrm{lex}_\psi(-f)$ and $f \mapsto -\mathrm{uex}_\psi(-f)$ both restrict to ψ on $\mathrm{dom}(\psi)$ and thus belong to $\mathrm{OP}_\psi(\mathrm{OP}(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R}),\mathbb{R})$. This proves (10). The last statement is a straightforward consequence of (8)-(10).

Example 7.10. Specializing Theorem 7.9 to Examples 7.5-7.8 we obtain the well-known linearity theorems for limits of sequences, continuous functions, limits of functions of real variable and integrals.

References

[1] Abbas Edalat and André Lieutier, *Domain theory and differential calculus (functions of one variable)*, Math. Structures Comput. Sci. **14** (2004), no. 6, 771–802.

[2] L. Fuchs, *Partially ordered algebraic systems*, Pergamon Press, Oxford-London-New York-Paris; Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, Mass.-Palo Alto, Calif.-London, 1963.

[3] Saunders Mac Lane, *Categories for the working mathematician*, 2nd ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 5, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.

[4] Walter Rudin, *Principles of mathematical analysis*, 3rd ed., McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-Auckland-Düsseldorf, 1976. International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics.
[5] Paul Taylor, *Practical foundations of mathematics*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 59, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
[6] ———, *A lambda calculus for real analysis*, J. Log. Anal. **2** (2010), Paper 5, 115.
[7] The Univalent Foundations Program, *Homotopy type theory—univalent foundations of mathematics*, The Univalent Foundations Program, Princeton, NJ; Institute for Advanced Study (IAS), Princeton, NJ, 2013.